



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—POLICE POWER—REGULATION OF SHEEP HERDING.—*SWEET v. BALLENTINE*, 69 PAC. 995 (IDAHO).—*Held*, statutes prohibiting the grazing and herding of sheep within two miles of inhabited dwellings, are valid police regulations. Affirming *Sifers v. Johnson*, 65 PAC. 709 (IDAHO).

No such law as this appears to exist in any other State. Apparently the only authority on the subject is 2 *Tied.*, *Fed. Con. of Pers. and Prop.* p. 838: "The clash of interests between stock-raising and farming calls for the interference of the State by the institution of police regulations; and whether the regulations shall subordinate the stock-raising interest to that of farming, or vice versa, is a matter for the legislative discretion, and is not a judicial question." Stockslager, J., strongly dissents, and holds that to give one citizen an advantage over another in the mere matter of the use of public domain, or in mere matter of general privileges and advantages, is an unconstitutional discrimination.

CUSTOMS DUTIES—IMPORTATIONS FROM ALGERIA—QUESTION FOR THE COURTS.—*TARTAR CHEMICAL CO. v. UNITED STATES*, 116 FED. 726.—The board of general appraisers connected with the State Department had decided, contrary to the evidence furnished by the French government, that Algeria is not a part of France, but simply a French colony and not within the scope of the reciprocal commercial agreement between France and the United States. On appeal, *held*, that this is a judicial question for the courts and not a political one on which the determination of an executive department is conclusive.

It is clear that section 15 of the Customs Administrative Act, 26 U. S. Stat. 137, under which jurisdiction is claimed to try cases on appeal from the board of appraisers, does not apply to "political" questions, which have always been held to be under the control of the executive branch of the government. *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 170. The jurisdiction of the court then depends entirely upon whether this question is political or not, and on this point it is difficult to see the correctness of this decision. As is admitted in the opinion, if there was any dispute as to the boundaries or sovereignty of a foreign state, it would be a political question. *Foster v. Neilson*, 2 Pet. 253; *Guadalupe Co. v. Wilson Co.*, 58 Tex. 228. So also if it were a question of the recognition of a foreign state. *Luther v. Borden*, 7 Howard 1. "Nor is it material to inquire, nor the province of the court to determine whether the executive be right or wrong." *Williams v. Ins. Co.*, 13 Pet. 415. Just what questions are "political" has never been judicially determined, and the opinion in the present case holds that the questions involved in such cases as those described above are political, only because connected with some dispute between States. But if questions concerning the boundaries of States be political, 1 *Wharton on Internat. Law* 551, it is hard to see why the decision as to whether a certain territory is a separate colony or an integral part of a foreign state, is not also political; and though there is no open dispute in the present case, there is a distinct difference of opinion as to the status of Algeria. The reasoning on which the exclusive jurisdiction of the executive over political questions is based would seem to apply. See *Williams v. Ins. Co.*, 13 Pet. 415; *Foster v. Neilson*, 2 Pet. 253.

GIFTS—CAUSA MORTIS—PUBLIC POLICY.—*DENEFF v. HELMS*, 70 PAC. 390 (ORE.).—Testator just previous to his death, and in expectation of it, de-